

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2009, claims 1-6 have been amended. Claims 1-6 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

II. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicant's attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. Unless otherwise indicated, these amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (2) of the Office Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Freeman et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0188943 (Freeman) and Rainville et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0069411 (Rainville).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the arguments presented herein.

Response to Office Action Comments

Applicant notes that the claim objections, and the double patenting and 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections, are not repeated in the Office Action of July 24, 2009. Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the prior response with regard to these issues.

Applicant also appreciates the response to the prior arguments, and will address those comments hereinbelow.

The Freeman Reference

The present invention relates to an interactive digital system. Various video and audio streams are collected from a live event and forwarded to a central control studio. Graphics are created at the central studio on a personal computer or chyron device. After receiving the video, audio and graphics signals, the signals are digitized and compressed in digital compressors. These signals are then combined with special data and subsequently transmitted.

In effect, a delayed video signal is viewed n number of frames after the signal has been received. When the user selects a different video path, by means of pressing a button on a keypad or other means, the controller 260 instructs the digital demultiplexer 210 to stop decoding signal A and lock onto signal B to begin decoding signal B instead of signal A.

While this is happening, even though the decompressor/decoder is no longer decompressing video signal A, the display is still showing video signal A because it is being read from the buffer 230. See [0091] – [0092].

The Rainville Reference

A system for enhancing the display of World Wide Web pages combined with television video signals on a TV screen includes enhanced display modes.

The Claims Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claims 1-6 recite systems and interfaces for allowing a user to select from and view a plurality of video images each representing a unique camera angle captured by one or more cameras at an event at a given venue to provide camera angle displays. An interface in accordance with one or more embodiments of the present invention comprises software for providing images to a viewing device, said viewing device further including on-screen indicia to a viewing device to facilitate navigation between said camera angle displays, said on-screen indicia comprises a transparent bar, a display of navigation keys to provide the user with directional navigation instructions, and a textual description of a current camera angle display being viewed, all superimposed upon said viewing device, and video image selection means for providing a user with a means of selecting from a variety of said camera angle displays for viewing said event at any time during the event, such that selecting a particular camera angle from the variety of camera angles directly changes from the current camera angle to the particular camera angle at the time of selecting the particular camera angle.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicant's independent claims. Specifically, the cited references do not teach nor suggest at least the limitations of on-screen indicia to a viewing device to facilitate navigation between said camera angle displays, and video image selection means for selecting from a variety of said camera angle displays for viewing said event at any time during the event, such that selecting a particular camera angle from the variety of camera angles directly changes from the current camera angle to the particular camera

angle at the time of selecting the particular camera angle as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Discussion of Prior Submitted Arguments

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, Applicant apologizes for any confusion regarding the prior submitted arguments. Applicant was not attempting to argue against the references individually. Applicant was merely restating the October 15, 2008 Office Action's rejections.

On page 4, lines 1-3 of the October 15, 2008 Office Action, it states:

"It is noted Freeman et al differs from the present invention in that it fails to particularly disclose and on-screen viewing indicia to a viewing device to facilitate navigation between the camera angle displays as specified in claims 1-6."

Thus, Applicant's statements that "[t]he Office Action admits that Freeman does not disclose an on-screen indicia for facilitating navigation between the camera angles. Applicant agrees with this portion of the characterization of Freeman" was merely a restatement of the Office Action's rejections and admissions of Freeman's lack of teaching of this element of the claims.

The October 15, 2008 Office Action goes on to say, on page 4, lines 3-7, the following:

"Rainville et al however, in Figure 3, teaches the concept of such well known on-screen indicia comprises a transparent bar 503, a display of navigation keys to provide the user with directional navigation instructions, and a textual description of the current camera angle being viewed (e.g., Fig. 3) all superimposed upon the viewing device 500."

The Applicant's prior statements that "The Office Action relies on Rainville to teach this limitation. Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of Rainville" again merely restated the Office Action rejection, and traversed the Office Action's characterization of the Rainville reference.

Since the October 15, 2008 Office Action admitted that Freeman did not disclose this element, and the only other reference cited was Rainville, Applicant traversed the rejection because regardless of the combination of the two cited references, neither reference taught the limitation of the claims.

Discussion of the Rejections

The Office Action maintains the rejections on the same references. Applicant continues to traverse the rejections.

Initially, again, Applicant points out that Freeman does not teach the on-screen indicia. The Office Action points to FIG. 1 as teaching this limitation. Applicant traverses this characterization of Freeman.

The Office Action of July 24, 2009 now states on page 2, paragraph 3, that:

“Regarding applicant’s argument that neither Freeman et al nor Rainville et al discloses the on-screen indicia to identify the camera angle images, it was clearly stated in the previous office action that Freeman et al discloses all these means in Figure 1. It is true that Rainville et al does not disclose any on-screen displays related to the transparent video as that claimed by the Applicant. However, examiner does not rely on Rainville et al to teach such capabilities because they are already disclosed in Freeman et al.”

Applicant is confused in that the Office Action of October 15, 2008 states that **“Freeman et al differs from the present invention in that it fails to particularly disclose and on-screen viewing indicia to a viewing device to facilitate navigation between the camera angle displays”** but the Office Action of July 24, 2009 states that **“it was clearly stated in the previous office action that Freeman et al discloses all these means in Figure 1.”**

Freeman FIG. 1 shows various cameras 100 at different viewing angles, but the Digital TV 195 and TV Monitor 165 outputs (which would show the on-screen indicia) are not shown in FIG. 1 or in any figure of Freeman. Thus, Freeman fails to teach the on-screen viewing indicia as admitted in the Office Action of October 15, 2008, and cannot teach the on-screen indicia as stated in the Final Office Action of July 24, 2009.

The Office Action of July 24, 2009 now admits that Rainville does not teach the on-screen displays, and that the Examiner merely relies on Rainville to modify Freeman. However, since neither Freeman nor Rainville teach the on-screen indicia as admitted in the Office Actions, Applicant is unaware how any combination of the reference can teach or suggest a limitation of the claims that is admittedly absent in both references.

Although Rainville teaches a combined video image with a picture-in-picture internet page, FIG. 3, which is cited in the Office Action, merely teaches a transparent overlay. Nowhere does Rainville’s overlay indicate that the underlying video image is of a particular camera angle, or even related to the camera angle.

Thus, the rejection cannot, and admittedly does not, rely on Freeman to teach an on-screen indicia of a particular camera angle because an on-screen indicia is never shown in Freeman, and the rejection cannot, and admittedly does not, rely on Rainville because Rainville never shows any nexus between the on-screen indicia and the particular camera angle being shown in the underlying video. This argument does not attack each reference individually. This argument shows that no combination of the cited references can teach or suggest the limitation mentioned when the limitation is never cited in either reference. Whether the references are taken individually or in any combination, the limitation is not taught.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to further remove the claims from the teaching of the references. Freeman clearly states that the switching from one video to another does not take place at the time of the request. Freeman either must wait for a command inserted prior to transmission (see [0050]), a command that is scattered throughout the program (see [0050]), or continuously buffer the first video until the user inputs a command to switch to a new camera angle (see [0091] – [0092]).

The present invention does not suffer from these limitations. The present invention allows for the user to change from one camera angle to another at any time during the event and have the request to change camera angle take place at the time of selecting the particular camera angle. Freeman specifically teaches away from this limitation, because Freeman must wait to allow the change request to be displayed on the monitor.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Freeman and Rainville. In addition, Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by Freeman and Rainville.

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1-6 are allowable over Freeman and Rainville.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Should any fees be associated with this submission, please charge Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 24, 2009

By: 

Name: Todd N. Snyder

Reg. No.: 41,320

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA/LA1/A109
2230 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo CA 90245
Telephone No. 310-964-0560